VOLUME VII MARCH, 1921 NUMBER 3

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD
CAMBRIDGE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

General Announcements

New President 3

Officers of Local Branches 3

American University Union in Europe 3

The Smith-Towner Bill 3

Colorado School of Mines 7

University Commissions at the University of Chicago 11

Dartmouth Local Branch, Joint Committee of Trustees and Faculty 13

Recent Educational Discussion

President Lowell's Report 17

Professor Leighton at the University of Michigan 25

The American Oxonian 34

A National Survey of State Universities 36

Committees, List of 38

Nominations for Membership 45

Treasurer's Report for 1920 48

Contributions to 1919 Deficit 48

GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

PRESIDENCY.—In accordance with authorization by the annual meeting the Council has elected Professor E. R. A. Seligman of Columbia University, President of the Association for 1921.

OFFICERS OF LOCAL BRANCHES.—The following local branches have reported recent elections of officers: Fargo College, F. E. Stratton, Chairman, G. R. Vowles, Secretary; University of Maine, George D. Chase, Chairman, H. M. Ellis, Secretary; Swarthmore College, Isabelle Bronk, Chairman, W. I. Hull, Secretary; Williams College, H. D. Wild, Chairman.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY UNION IN EUROPE.—A bulletin dated January, 1921, contains the annual reports for 1919–20 of the Directors of the Continental and the British Divisions, an account of the Secretary's visit to the London and Paris offices, and the report of the Finance Committee.

THE SMITH-TOWNER BILL

At the request of the American Council on Education the following questions were transmitted to members of the Council and to officers of Local Branches in the early fall of 1920:

1. Is the creation of a Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet endorsed?
2. Is the principle of Federal aid to education in the states on condition that the states match the Federal appropriation endorsed?
3. Should a Department of Education supervise the expenditure of Federal appropriations in the states?
4. Should a Department of Education be authorized to determine acceptable standards for various types of institutions, to inspect institutions within the states and to publish its findings?
5. Is the Smith-Towner Bill endorsed without amendments?
6. Is an amendment of the Smith-Towner Bill to provide for the inclusion of the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the Department of Education favored?
7. Is an amendment of the Smith-Towner Bill to eliminate the proposed appropriations for cooperation with states and to pro-

vide for an investigation and report by the Department of Education on the distribution of Federal aid and the amount needed for specific purposes favored?

8. Is an amendment of the Smith-Towner Bill to provide for the appointment by the Department of Education of an advisory council favored?

9. Is the Kenyon Bill endorsed?

10. Is any other policy of Federal participation in education suggested?

The Council referendum vote seems to have been relatively light, presumably on account of the complexity of the issues involved and the bulk of the arguments presented. On the general principles specified ten members favored the creation of the department of education, with a seat in the cabinet, four opposed; ten favored federal aid on condition of state equivalent, three opposed; ten favored departmental supervision of expenditures, three opposed; nine favored departmental determination of standards, inspection of institutions and publication of findings, five opposed. Nine out of ten members were opposed to the bill in its present form; nine favored including the Federal Board for Vocational Education. On the question of an amendment to eliminate appropriations, providing only for investigation and report, the vote was five to five. Eleven favored the appointment of an Advisory Council, none were opposed.

The following action of the senate of the University of Chicago is of interest in this connection:

"The Senate submits, as its reply to the referendum, the following statement of the defects which it finds in the present bills and of the general principles which in its judgment should be embodied in federal legislation on education.

"The following defects in the pending bills are noted:

"The scope and character of federal participation in education are not adequately defined. Especially is the situation left wholly ambiguous with regard to the relation of education in the common branches to education in industrial and agricultural courses.

"There is no consistent policy with regard to the relation of the federal government and the states. In certain sections of the Smith-Towner Bill, as in sections 10 and 13, the principle of

federal supervision is clearly recognized, while in section 14 a principle of exclusive state control of schools is enunciated.

"The sums of money to be appropriated from the federal treasury are chosen without adequate background of information regarding the needs and capacities of the various states; and the principles of distribution of such sums as are named are unscientific and inadequate.

"There is no consideration of the problems of higher education and no provision for the proper coordination of the different levels of American education into a coherent system.

"In view of these defects in the pending bills, it seems fitting to urge that the whole matter be recanvassed for the purpose of framing a substitute measure which will unite the interests of those who have been active in promoting the present bills, as well as of those who, through their representatives in the American Council on Education, have initiated the present discussion and referendum. As a contribution to such a movement for complete revision the following outline of general principles is submitted and advocated.

"Whatever federal agency is set up for the promotion of education should be so organized as to give explicit recognition to the fact that the public-school system of the United States is a unit system, not a system administratively divided so as to separate general education from industrial education or higher schools from lower.

"Federal participation in education is desirable in so far as it provides for the study and presentation of standards of education and provides agencies to promote the acceptance of these standards by communities in all parts of the country. This principle contemplates the creation of an agency which is primarily scientific in character, after the analogy of the Department of Agriculture. The activities of such an agency may lead to far-reaching movements in American education, and it is wholly undesirable at this time to lay down negative principles which will limit the establishment of national standards. It is desirable that federal subsidies, if such are to be made, be based on the broad and thoroughly scientific consideration of the principles which govern, and are to govern, the securing of all types of school revenues.

"Any federal educational agency created by Congress should be competent to present to Congress from time to time plans for the enlargement of the American educational system and should be competent to administer with authority such laws as Congress may enact pertaining to education. It should not be competent to issue rules and regulations, as is the present Board for Voca-

tional Education, nor, on the other hand, should it be limited in its scope, as is the present Bureau of Education, to the mere collection of information. Above all, it should not have as its chief function the disbursing of appropriations to the states.

"In short, a plan of national participation in education should be evolved which will operate to equalize educational opportunities and improve standards in all sections of the country. This plan should be based at every step on definite reports laid before Congress and should become operative to the extent, and only to the extent, to which Congress gives its explicit approval.

"As in other matters, so also in the case of federal appropriations, action should not be taken in loose, general terms and monies should not be turned over to the states without full and explicit definition by Congress of the relation of federal expenditures to local expenditures, both with regard to the needs which are to be met and also with regard to the standards which are to be attained.

"Appropriations other than those which provide for the maintenance of a scientific federal agency are at this time premature and any action providing for such appropriations should be detached from the bill dealing with the fundamental issue which is that of providing a proper agency to make investigations and recommendations to Congress.

"The Senate of the University of Chicago, believing as it does in the great importance of the proposal that a federal educational agency of broad scope be created, and holding that adherence to the foregoing principles is essential to the adoption of wise measures, urges that the American Council on Education make the problem of promoting the full discussion of this matter one of its major undertakings and that it take steps to secure a full hearing before Congress and the President of the United States."

The general situation from the standpoint of the American Council on Education is summed up by the Director as follows:

"Early in 1920 the Executive Committee of the Council authorized the Director to conduct a referendum on important federal legislation. The questions to be submitted on the referendum ballot were discussed at the annual meeting of the Council on May 7 and 8, 1920. Shortly after this date the ballot was issued together with a brief explanatory pamphlet giving the arguments for and against each of the questions asked. Because the aca-

demic year was just closing the referendum could not be brought to the attention of the university senates, college faculties and governing boards of associations before autumn. Since the reopening of the higher institutions, however, returns have come in steadily. Most of the faculty groups have studied the questions presented with great care. In many cases special committees have been appointed to make further investigation and report for the benefit of their respective faculties before the vote was taken. The local branches of the American Association of University Professors have also given the referendum ballot especial attention. The results represent a body of mature opinion that should be valuable in determining the action finally to be taken by Congress. Inasmuch as there is slight prospect of radical legislation bearing on education during the present session, it is thought best to postpone the summarization of the returns until they are as nearly complete as possible. The Council's office has up to date received the votes of fifty-seven universities, colleges and associations."—*The Educational Record, January, 1921.*

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES

The Colorado School of Mines Magazine for December, 1920, contained vigorous and on the whole favorable discussion of the report of this Association in regard to the extraordinary conditions existing in that institution, as illustrated by the following extracts:

"I am sure that if our graduates really realized the gravity of the situation they would not be so indifferent to this report and would not sanction the attitude taken by the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees have maintained that they are legally appointed by the Governor to the trusteeship of the School of Mines and that they therefore are alone responsible for its administration, and that no outside organization has any business to meddle in their affairs. This attitude clearly stamps the self-exalted opinion and narrow-mindedness of the Board of Trustees. By their attitude they have virtually ostracized the Colorado School of Mines in the eyes of the educational world.

"Conditions are fundamentally wrong at Golden, first with regard to the system of appointing trustees. The present system

of appointments by the Governor places the administration of the Colorado School of Mines in politics. Occasionally good men are appointed to the trusteeship, but more frequently they are not. A study of the personnel of the trustees during the past will confirm this statement. Likewise the fundamental policy of hiring professors on a contract basis is equally bad. They are usually given a year contract and reappointed at the end of the year upon the recommendation of the President. This clearly gives the President tyrannical power which is not conducive to getting the best type of teachers. In the past we have lost many of our best men because of this feature.

"You can imagine yourself in the position where you are not sure at the end of each year whether you will be retained for another, especially if some occasion has arisen during the year in which you have invoked the wrath of the President. One of the fundamental principles of education involves this point. A professor, after he has made good, should feel reasonably secure in his position. Of course, if a professor is incapable he should be dismissed after the first year and not retained or actually promoted, as has been done in the past. Under the present system and condition of affairs at Golden, it is impossible to attract and retain superior teachers. When a vacancy occurs in the faculty, it is almost impossible to secure trained teachers from other institutions who ordinarily would be delighted with an opportunity to teach in a school of this specialized character. Instead, it is necessary to resort to employment agencies. It is proper to use these agencies perhaps for securing instructors, but it should not be necessary for assistant professors except in emergencies. Thus men are obtained with little or no teaching experience or of unproven ability. This is a dangerous policy as well as being unfair to the students. Occasionally a man obtained in this manner qualifies, but, as experience has shown, more frequently not. We have some very able instructors at Golden, but almost without exception these are here as a temporary expediency—they are waiting an opportunity to get out; or are attracted by the ideal location and climate at Golden. You have but to read the "Loyalty Resolution" (see page 225) which was passed by the Board of Trustees last year, to substantiate these assertions. If it were not for temporary expediency do you suppose these men would have tolerated such an insult? They

attempted to instigate proceedings to demand that the trustees rescind this resolution, but through lack of cooperation on the part of two colleagues (especial favorites of Alderson), who they feared would betray the movement, nothing was done. To this day, this is a sore spot in the hearts of most of the professors. This resolution is a dangerous doctrine. It has been assiduously spread as a bludgeon to maintain discipline. This is a stupid ruling which confuses loyalty to the administration with loyalty to the School. It is high time to stop such nonsensical propaganda and to consider the possibility of disloyalty to the School resulting from the support of an administration which is itself disloyal to the School and its traditions.

"Board of Trustees, you are hopelessly lacking in decency and common sense. Do you suppose you can obtain true loyalty by coercion? Never! Loyalty is inspired, not instilled. If you or your President were the right sort of men, such legislation would be unnecessary. You insult your faculty and make them lose their self-respect, whereas your janitors and other school employees are protected from your tyrannies by virtue of the Civil Service Commission.

"Conditions are fundamentally wrong at Golden and require immediate correction. . . . The only immediate solution lies in placing the School under the authority of the regency of the University of Colorado."

The sequel as published in the January issue of the School of Mines Magazine is instructive, though too extended for quotation in full.

January 13, the trustees adopted the following resolution:

"WHEREAS, the attention of the Board has been called to an article published in the Colorado School of Mines Magazine of December, 1920, in which, amongst other things, an alleged report by the American Association of University Professors derogatory to the School is contained, but the reply of the Board to the affidavits quoted is intentionally omitted; and,

"WHEREAS, Hon. Herbert S. Hadley, one of the committee whose name appears as signed to the report, states that he did not sign the same and that the use of his name in connection therewith was wholly unauthorized which, in the opinion of the Board, without further investigation is conclusive as to the spuriousness of said alleged report. . . .

"WHEREAS, said publication in the Colorado School of Mines Magazine was intended to injure our institution, its character

and reputation before its friends, patrons, and the public in general, and is false and libelous in its nature; and,

"WHEREAS, the School is functioning without friction in all of its departments and with the strongest faculty and best prepared student body in the annals of the School; therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Board withhold its financial support from the Magazine and refuse to furnish headquarters in the school buildings for the editor of the same, to take effect immediately, until such time as the Magazine shall loyally support the School and fulfill its obligations to the institution and its alumni."

January 17, the editor of the School of Mines Magazine was notified of the discontinuance of financial support and requested to vacate the premises of the School. As he declined to do this unless on the authority of the Alumni Association, his effects were removed.

January 24, the editor addressed an inquiry to Professor Hadley, to which the latter replied, January 25, as follows:

"*Dear Sir:* At the request of Dr. Libby, who was a member of the committee investigating the School of Mines, I assisted him in the preparation of the report, though I was not then a member of the Association. The fact that I had helped Mr. Libby was known to the officers of the Association and was, I assume, the reason why my name was published as a member of the committee. This information was, I understand, recently given to Mr. Rubey by Dr. Norlin* while they were talking over educational affairs in the State."

Later material in the same issue indicates an effort on the part of the trustees and their friends to make it appear that underlying the whole agitation is a desire to annex the School of Mines to the State University at Boulder. The general tenor of the material published indicates the extreme difficulty of maintaining proper academic standards under the conditions at Golden with a local group of trustees not amenable to public opinion except as it may be represented by the Golden Chamber of Commerce, whose sympathetic resolutions are printed in the Magazine.

The editor's valedictory, resigning his office, reads in part as follows:

"The vast majority of our men are united in their opinion that the School of Mines can never live up to its past traditions with

* President of the State University and an honorary member of this Association.

Dr. Victor C. Alderson as President. The evil effects of the notoriety resulting from the removal of the U. S. Bureau of Mines and the Report of the American Association of University Professors intensified their disgust because, in spite of all this, Alderson remained in office. Hence their indifference towards (Alumni) Association affairs. The trustees have attempted to secure a new man for President, but because of the fundamental defects existing in administrative policies, no self-respecting man possessing the requisite qualifications, will accept the position regardless of the salary offered. The trustees seem to be unable to realize this and therefore give Alderson their unqualified support. It is evident that the first step necessary to reestablish the prestige of our Alma Mater is to remedy these fundamental defects. This can only be accomplished by legislation, and this in turn can only be secured by making the demand sufficiently insistent. Hence, the reason for my article appearing at the time the legislature convened. Bills have been introduced in the legislature which, if enacted, will rectify these fundamental conditions."

COMMISSIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

". . . To replace the University Congregation, which was established at the annual meeting of the Board of Trustees in June, 1896, and which has long ceased to function, the Board of Trustees has established fourteen University Commissions.

"Feeling that one of the primary needs of the University is a more active participation in its affairs by the alumni and the development among them of a keener sense of responsibility for its well-being, believing also that with the rapid growth of the University points of contact between the Trustees and the members of the Faculties need to be multiplied in order that each may better understand the point of view and purposes of the other; confident, moreover, that the future prosperity of the University must depend to no small degree upon its success in enlisting the intelligent interest of leading citizens of Chicago and the Central West who do not happen to be among its alumni and Trustees, the Committee briefly formulated the objects of the Commissions as follows: to promote the interest of the University of Chicago by (1) fostering a closer relationship between the

alumni and the University; (2) developing a closer relationship between the Faculties and the Board of Trustees; (3) developing more actively the interest of representative Chicagoans in the University.

"The duty of each Commission is to study the work of its school or group and from time to time to make suggestions to the Board of Trustees as to the manner and means of improving the work of the school or group. These suggestions are to be sent to the Board of Trustees through the President of the University who shall transmit them to the Board with his recommendations.

"There will be fourteen University Commissions, one for each of the centers of interest in the university life: The Law School, The Medical School, The Divinity School, The School of Education, The School of Commerce and Administration, The College of Arts, Literature, and Science, etc. Of each of these Commissions the President of the University is *ex-officio* member. On each Commission there will be two alumni, one of whom is to be elected by the Alumni Council, the other to be appointed by the president of the Board of Trustees on recommendation of the President of the University; two or more residents of Chicago, or vicinity, not connected in an official capacity with the University who will be appointed by the president of the Board of Trustees upon recommendation by the President of the University; two members of the Faculty who, whenever practicable, will be heads of departments or Deans closely associated with given departments and will be appointed by the Board of Trustees on recommendation by the President of the University; one member of the Board of Trustees and an alternate member to be appointed by the president of the Board of Trustees. It is to be noted that when one Commission is appointed for two departments one Faculty member of the Commission shall be appointed from each department. If the group is composed of more than two departments then one member shall be added from the Faculty to represent each additional department. The term of office is to be two years. . . .

"Each Commission is to meet at least once each quarter excepting during the Summer Quarter, and at least one meeting each year is to be with the teaching force of all departments of groups represented. There is to be at least one joint meeting of all the commissions and the Board of Trustees of the

University during the Spring Quarter of each year. Special meetings may be called in accordance with such regulations as may be provided by the Commissions or upon the call of the chairman of the Commissions. At these meetings the work of the group is to be considered from all points of view represented. Suggestions for improvements may be made at any time by the Commission to the Board of Trustees through the President of the University.

"A further effort of the members of the Board of Trustees to come into closer contact with the members of the Faculties appears in a new by-law of the Board of Trustees establishing an annual dinner in honor of members of the Faculties. . . ."—*University Record, October, 1920.*

DARTMOUTH LOCAL BRANCH, JOINT COMMITTEE OF TRUSTEES AND FACULTY

"On May 20, 1916, after hearing the report of a special committee on Practical Proposals dealing with Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, the Branch voted to request the Faculty 'to authorize its Committee on Nominations to appoint a committee to confer with a committee of the Trustees, provided the Trustees appoint such committee.'

"The proposal met with the favorable action of both Faculty and Trustees, and a joint committee, representative of both bodies was created. As the result of its deliberations a Committee of the Trustees submitted the following propositions which were adopted by the Board of Trustees and by the Faculty of Dartmouth College, and were printed under date of June 4, 1917:

"(1) That in accordance both with precedent and inclination of the Board the procedure be continued under which an election to a professorship or associate professorship shall be considered as on the basis of permanency, rather than as a term appointment. It is recognized that no teacher of any rank should, except in cases of grave moral delinquency, receive notice of dismissal or of refusal of reappointment later than three months before the close of any academic year; and that in the cases of teachers above the rank of instructor who have had at least three years of service in the institution, one year's notice should be given.

"It should be understood, however, that there is a mutual equity in this matter, and that members of the Faculty recognize a moral obligation not to ask release under circumstances detrimental to the best interests of the College without affording reasonable time for the College to make necessary readjustments.

"(2) That official action relating to appointments, reappointments, and refusals of reappointment, to positions above the grade of instructor, should be taken only after consultation with a committee of the Faculty appointed as advisory to the President for this purpose; and in the case of instructors such official action should be taken only after consultation with the acting head of the department concerned.

"The committee herein referred to shall consist of six members —five chosen by the President from a group of eight nominated by vote of the Faculty, and the Dean.

"The Trustees would like in this connection to call attention to the occasional need, for the good of the service, that a member of the Faculty shall be demoted, or even dismissed; and would wish to have the endorsement of the Faculty upon the proposition that, to the extent that this committee is given participation in the policies having to do with advancement of members of the Faculty, in like manner it shall share responsibility in the occasional perplexing problems connected with inefficient service or non-ability to make their work of advantage to the College.

"(3) That every College teacher shall be entitled, before dismissal or demotion, to have the reasons upon which the action is projected stated in writing, and to have an investigation of those reasons before the above-mentioned advisory committee, unless that committee, together with the President, shall unanimously agree that for the good of the College the dismissal or demotion should take place without such presentation of reasons and investigation. In case such an investigation is desired and conceded, the committee shall have the power, or at the request of the President shall be required, to make public a full account of its findings.

"In regard to this Section 3, the Trustees believe such provision to be unnecessary and likely to be undesirable alike from the point of view of the College and of the man whose case might be under consideration; but they are willing to establish the procedure if it is desired by members of the Faculty.

"The Committee of the Trustees would further express their confidence in the principle of mutual conference between representatives of the Trustees and the Faculty, and would definitely

propose the appointment of a standing conference committee consisting of three members each from the Trustees and the Faculty, for the discussion of matters of common interest.

JUNE 4, 1917.

"Two interpretations have since been approved by the Faculty of the College, upon the initiative of the Dartmouth Branch of the Association. The first was proposed on December 12, 1919, and reads as follows:

"That as a matter of record for the interpretation of the 'propositions submitted by a Committee of the Trustees, adopted by the Board of Trustees and by the Faculty of Dartmouth College,' and printed with date of June 4, 1917, that refusals of reappointment were not included in Section 3, such cases being provided for in Section 2.

"This means that the President after consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee, may refuse to reappoint a man whose term has expired, without incurring the obligation to state the reasons for such action in writing or hold a formal investigation as in the case of men dismissed or demoted for cause.

"A second interpretation of considerable interest and importance was proposed by the Branch on November 19, 1920, and approved by the Faculty a few days later. It reads as follows:

"The Faculty places upon its records and transmits to the Trustees, as its recognition of the obligation resting upon the individual members of the Faculty, the following interpretation of Article (1) paragraph two, of 'The Propositions adopted by the Board of Trustees and by the Faculty of Dartmouth College,' and printed with the date of June 4, 1917.

"In recognition of 'the moral obligation not to ask release under circumstances detrimental to the best interests of the College,' and of the fact that resignations of professors and of assistant professors who have had at least three years of service in the institution, late in the college year, or during the summer vacation, do not 'afford reasonable time for the College to make necessary readjustments,' especially in view of the provision for consultation between the President of the College and the Advisory Committee, the Faculty hereby expressed its judgment that professors asking release should do so, if possible, by May 1, and in any case not later than June 1, and that assistant professors, who have had at least three years of service in the institution, asking release should do so not later than June 10 (June the tenth).

"The following amendment has since become a part of the interpretation:

"In accordance with the prevailing principle of conference between President and Faculty, it is understood that in case of calls unexpectedly received after June 1 or June 10, respectively, a Professor or Assistant Professor of at least three years service would be free to lay the facts before the President and seek his counsel as to what action might be taken without injury to the best interests of the College."

RECENT EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

ORGANIZATION OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.—Extracts from the annual report of the President of Harvard University:

"The question of the organization of universities and colleges, of the relation between the faculties and the governing boards, has of late years provoked much discussion, and it may not be out of place to consider the problem from the point of view of our own history and traditions. The form of corporate organization with which we are most familiar is the industrial. Concerns of this kind are created by capitalists who take all the risks of the business, conduct it through a board of directors whom they select, and employ the various grades of persons who serve it. The rights and duties of all persons employed are fixed by a contract with the corporation, that is with the owners of the property, and extend only so far as they are contractual. The main reason for the present form of industrial organization is that capital originates the enterprise and takes the risk. For that reason the board of directors is elected by the owners of the capital. Other kinds of industrial organization can be imagined, and have existed. A body of workers may get together, secure the use of capital at a fixed rate of interest, and conduct the business themselves. But whatever other forms of corporate organization might exist, it is natural that we should take our ideas from the one to which we are most accustomed, and apply them to institutions of all kinds. Yet to do so in the case of universities and colleges, where the conditions are very different, creates confusion and does harm. In this case, there are no owners who take the risk of the business. The institutions are not founded for profit, but for the purpose of preserving, transmitting and increasing knowledge. The trustees, or whatever the members of the governing board may be called, although vested with the legal title to the property, are not the representatives of private owners, for there are none. They are custodians, holding the property in trust to promote the objects of the institution.

"In the Middle Ages, when the universities first appeared, their property was held and the enterprise conducted practically by the academic body. This is the condition today of the colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, where the property of a college is vested in, and all its affairs are conducted by, the Fellows. In most places this state of things has not continued. In continental Europe the property has become vested, as a rule, in the State, which has also the ultimate power of control. In the American endowed universities it has become vested in a board, or boards, distinct, for the most part, from the teaching staff.

"The transformation at Harvard is interesting. The College was founded in 1636 by a vote of the General Court appropriating money for that object. In 1642 an act was passed for the government of the College, placing the control in the hands of a Board of Overseers, composed of the Governor, the Deputy Governor, the Magistrates, and the Ministers of the six adjoining towns. This was followed in 1650 by another act creating a corporation, after the pattern of an English college, composed of the President, Treasurer, and five Fellows, but acting under the supervision of the Overseers. In the early days a part of the five Fellows were resident teachers, or, as they were then called, Tutors. They could not all have belonged to that class, because it was three-quarters of a century before there were as many as five teachers beside the President. As a rule the Tutors seem to have been young men who served a short time while awaiting a call to a parish. Perhaps it was for this reason that more mature men from outside were elected to the Corporation. Certain it is that by the time the charter was twenty-five years old, if not before, we find among the Fellows ministers of the neighboring towns.

"Towards the close of the seventeenth century several attempts were made to revise the charter and introduce outside members, but for various reasons they all failed of adoption, and in 1707 the original charter was declared to be in force and has remained so ever since. The number of settled ministers among its members continued, however, to increase until in 1721 there had been for some time only one Fellow in the Corporation who was a teacher at the College. In that year two of the Tutors presented to the Overseers a memorial claiming places in the Corporation, apparently on the ground that they were resident fellows giving

instruction in the College and as such were the Fellows intended by the Charter of 1650. The Overseers sustained their claim; so did the House of Representatives, and the controversy dragged on for several years until it was finally brought to nought by the opposition of the Governor, backed eventually by his Council. The question was interwoven with an acute religious quarrel and a desire to remove the ministers in the Corporation whose ecclesiastical views were unpopular. Although the Corporation was not overborne, and the obnoxious Fellows were not removed, it yielded so far as to elect Tutors to the next vacancies that occurred, so that by 1725 three of them were members of the body.

"There continued to be two or three Tutors or Professors in the Corporation until 1779 when a notable change began. Save during the confused period at the close of the seventeenth century, when new charters were put into operation only to be defeated by refusal of the royal approval, the non-resident Fellows, that is those who were not teachers at the College, were always ministers of the neighboring towns. But the convulsion of the Revolution, the growth of the University and the financial difficulties caused by the war, 'indicated to the Corporation,' in the words of Quincy, 'the wisdom of selecting men of experience in business, and practically acquainted with public affairs.' The first man of the new type was James Bowdoin, elected in 1779; and since that time almost every choice was of this kind, the occasional clergymen elected being chosen not because incumbents of the neighboring parishes but for their personal value as counsellors. The only teachers in the University thereafter elected Fellows were Professor Eliphalet Pearson who served from 1800 to 1806, and Professor Ephraim W. Gurney who served from 1884 to 1886.

"The change, however, did not take place without subsequent protest. In 1824 a memorial signed by eleven members of the instructing staff, claiming that according to the intent of the charter the Fellows ought to be resident, paid teachers, was presented first to the Corporation and then to the Overseers. While it was under consideration, a war of pamphlets was waged between John Lowell in opposition to the memorial and Edward Everett, then a Professor, in support of it. Each of them dealt keenly with as much of the early history of the College as he could find in contemporary records; and the impression left on the

reader today is that the framers of the charter had in mind in a vague way the organization of an English college, but that the word 'Fellow' was at that time used loosely, and that no distinct limitation was intended to be placed upon the selection. On January 25, 1825, the Overseers voted unanimously: (1) 'That it does not appear to this board that the resident instructors of Harvard University have any exclusive right to be chosen members of the Corporation'; (2) 'That it does not appear to this board that the members of the Corporation forfeit their offices by not residing in the College'; and (3) 'That, in the opinion of this board, it is not expedient to express any opinion on the subject of future elections.' The Overseers seem, however, to have thought that the instructing staff should be represented among the Fellows, for they refused to confirm the election to the next vacancy of Judge Jackson, one of their own number, until the Corporation stated its desire and purpose to elect a resident instructor a Fellow as soon as a proper occasion should offer. Within ten years Joseph Story and James Walker were appointed professors while Fellows, and retained their places on the Corporation; so that in a certain way the instructing staff was represented there; but the proper occasion for electing a resident instructor did not come until 1884 and the professor so chosen continued a Fellow for only two years. In short, the question of giving to the instructing staff a representation upon the Corporation was virtually settled in 1825, has never been seriously revived, and there appears to be no desire to revive it today.

"The transition which has taken place at Harvard is an example of the differentiation of functions that comes with the growth in size and complexity of an institution. More recent universities and colleges in America have not gone through this evolution, but have started with a body quite distinct from the instructing staff, and containing none of its members, except the President; yet a body in which the title to the property and the complete ultimate control are legally vested. This legal situation has no doubt led to the present unfortunate tendency to regard the boards of trustees of institutions of learning as analogous to the boards of directors of business corporations, their legal position being the same. In spite, however, of a difference in legal organization, the best and most fruitful conception of a university or college is the ancient one of a society or guild

of scholars associated together for preserving, imparting, increasing, and enjoying knowledge.

"If a university or college is a society or guild of scholars why does it need any separate body of trustees at all? Why more than learned societies which are obviously groups of scholars, and have no such boards recruited outside their own membership? One reason is to be found in the large endowments of our institutions of learning that require for investment a wide knowledge and experience of business affairs. In fact, as already pointed out, the vast complexity of a modern university has compelled specialization of functions, and one aspect thereof is the separation of the scholarly and business organs. Another reason is that higher education has assumed more and more of a public character; its importance has been more fully recognized by the community at large; it must therefore keep in touch with public needs, make the public appreciate its aims, and the means essential to attain them; and for this purpose it must possess the influence and obtain the guidance of men conversant with the currents of the outer world.

"There is a further reason more fundamental if less generally understood. Teaching in all its grades is a public service, and the administration of every public service must comprise both expert and lay elements. Without the former it will be ineffectual; without the latter it will become in time narrow, rigid or out of harmony with its public object. Each has its own distinctive function, and only confusion and friction result if one of them strives to perform the functions of the other. From this flows the cardinal principle, popularly little known but of well-nigh universal application, that experts should not be members of a non-professional body that supervises experts. One often hears that men with a practical knowledge of teaching should be elected to school boards, but unless they are persons of singular discretion they are likely to assume that their judgment on technical matters is better than that of the teachers, with effects that are sometimes disastrous. Laymen should not attempt to direct experts about the method of attaining results, but only indicate the results to be attained. Many years ago the Board of Overseers, after a careful examination, came to the conclusion that the writing of English by Harvard undergraduates was sadly defective. In this they were acting wholly within their proper

province, and the result was a very notable improvement in the teaching of English composition. But if they had attempted to direct how the subject should be taught they would have been hopelessly beyond their province. They would not have known, as the instructing staff did, how it should be done, and they would have exasperated and disheartened the teachers.

"But another question may well be asked. Granted that there should be both expert and non-professional elements in the management of a university or college, why in a society or guild of scholars should the non-professional organ be the final authority? For this there are three reasons. In the first place, so far as the object is public—and where teaching is conducted on a large scale the object cannot fail to concern the public deeply—that object must in the final analysis be determined by public, that is by non-professional, judgment. In an endowed university the governing board does not, indeed, represent the public in the sense that it is elected by popular vote, but it is not on that account any less truly a trustee for the public.

"In the second place, the non-professional board is responsible for the financial administration, and the body that holds the purse must inevitably have the final control.

"Thirdly, the non-professional board is the only body, or the most satisfactory body, to act as arbiter between the different groups of experts. Everyone knows that in an American university or college there is a ceaseless struggle for the means of development between different departments, and someone must decide upon the relative merits of their claims. In a university with good traditions the professors would be more ready to rely on the fairness and wisdom of a well constituted board of trustees than on one composed of some of their own number each affected almost unavoidably by a bias in favor of his particular subject.

"Let it be observed, however, that although the governing board is the ultimate authority it is not in the position of an industrial employer. It is a trustee not to earn dividends for stockholders, but for the purposes of the guild. Its sole object is to help the society of scholars to accomplish the object for which they are brought together. They are the essential part of the society; and making their work effective for the intellectual and moral training of youth and for investigation is the sole reason for the existence of trustees, of buildings, of endowments

and of all the elaborate machinery of a modern university. If this conception be fully borne in mind most of the sources of dissension between professors and governing boards will disappear. At Harvard it has, I believe, been borne in mind as a deep-seated traditional conviction.

"The differences between the ordinary industrial employment and the conduct of a society or guild of scholars in a university are wide. In the industrial system of employment the employee is paid according to the value of his services; he can be discharged when no longer wanted; and his duties are prescribed as minutely as may be desired by the employer. In a university there is permanence of tenure; substantial equality of pay within each academic grade; and although the duties in general are well understood, there is great freedom in the method of performing them. It is not difficult to see why each of these conditions prevails, and is in fact dependent upon the others. Permanence of tenure lies at the base of the difference between a society of scholars in a university and the employees in an industrial concern. In the latter, under prevailing conditions, men are employed in order to promote its earning power. In a university the concern exists to promote the work of the scholars and of the students whom they teach. Therefore in the industrial concern an unprofitable employee is discharged, but in the university the usefulness of the scholar depends largely upon his sense of security, upon the fact that he can work for an object that may be remote and whose value may not be easily demonstrated. In a university, barring positive misconduct, permanence of tenure is essential for members who have passed the probationary period. The equality of pay goes with the permanence of tenure. In an industrial establishment the higher class of officials, those who correspond most nearly to the grade of professors, can be paid what they may be worth to the concern, and discharged if they are not worth their salaries. How valuable they are can be fairly estimated, and their compensation can be varied accordingly. But professors, whose tenure is permanent, cannot be discharged if they do not prove so valuable as they were expected to be. Moreover it is impossible to determine the value of scholars in the same way as that of commercial officials. An attempt to do so would create injustice and endless discontent; and it would offer a temptation to secure high pay, from their own

or another institution, by a display wholly inconsistent with the scholarly attitude of mind. The only satisfactory system is that of paying salaries on something very close to a fixed scale, and letting every professor do as good work as he can. In an industrial concern the prospect of a high salary may be needed to induce the greatest effort; but indolence among professors is seldom found. They may, indeed, prefer a line of work less important than some other; a man may desire to do research who is better fitted for teaching, or he may prefer to teach advanced students when there is a greater need of the strongest men in more elementary instruction; but failure to work hard is rare.

"The governing boards of universities having, then, the ultimate legal control in their hands, and yet not being in the position of industrial employers, it is pertinent to inquire what their relation to the professors should be. If we bear in mind the conception of a society or guild of scholars, that relation usually becomes in practice clear. The scholars, both individually and gathered into faculties, are to provide the expert knowledge; the governing board the financial management, the general coördination, the arbitral determinations, and the preservation of the general direction of public policy. In the words of a former member of the Harvard Corporation, their business is to 'serve tables.' The relation is not one of employer and employed, of superior and inferior, of master and servant, but one of mutual coöperation for the promotion of the scholars' work. Unless the professors have confidence in the singleness of purpose and in the wisdom of the governing boards, and unless these in their turn recognize that they exist to promote the work of the society of scholars, the relations will not have the harmony that they should. The relation is one that involves constant seeking of opinion, and in the main the university must be conducted, not by authority, but by persuasion. There is no natural antagonism of interests between trustees and professors. To suggest it is to suggest failure in their proper relation to one another; to suppose it is to provoke failure; to assume it is to ensure failure.

"The question has often been raised whether nominations for appointments should be made by the faculties or their committees, or by the president. It would seem that the less formal the provisions the better. Any president of a university or college who makes a nomination to the governing board without

consulting formally or informally the leading professors in the subject and without making sure that most of them approve of it, is taking a grave responsibility that can be justified only by a condition that requires surgery. The objection to a formal nomination by a faculty, or a committee thereof, is that it places the members in an uncomfortable position in regard to their younger colleagues, and that it creates a tendency for the promotion of useful rather than excellent men. A wise president will not make nominations without being sure of the support of the instructing staff, but he may properly, and indeed ought, to decline to make nominations unless convinced that the nominee is of the caliber that ought to be appointed.

"Attempts have been made to define, and express in written rules, the relation between the faculties and the governing boards; but the best element in that relation is an intangible, an undefinable, influence. If husband and wife should attempt to define by regulations their respective rights and duties in the household, that marriage could safely be pronounced a failure. The essence of the relation is mutual confidence and mutual regard; and the respective functions of the faculties and the governing boards—those things that each had better undertake, those it had better leave to the other, and those which require mutual concession—are best learned from experience and best embodied in tradition. Tradition has great advantages over regulations. It is a more delicate instrument; it accommodates itself to things that are not susceptible of sharp definition; it is more flexible in its application, making exceptions and allowances which it would be difficult to foresee or prescribe. It is also more stable. Regulations can be amended; tradition cannot, for it is not made, but grows, and can be altered only by a gradual change in general opinion, not by a majority vote. In short, it cannot be amended, but only outgrown."

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE FACULTY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF A UNIVERSITY.—Extracts from an address at the inauguration of the President of the University of Michigan:

". . . To enter immediately into the heart of the subject, I beg to call attention first to the fact that the functions actually exercised by faculties in good and progressive institutions in the determination of university policies and their execution is much

larger than the functions legally delegated to faculties by the constitutions and by-laws of universities in general. As a rule, faculties are legally empowered chiefly to deal with the governance of the curriculum and student body. *In fact,* they are frequently called upon to discuss and make recommendations upon matters of educational policy. They are normally consulted as to new appointments, they are consulted to a large extent in the choice of deans, and to some extent in the choice of presidents. They are frequently given a hearing on the matter of salary scale. Thus, to a large and growing extent, faculties enjoy the substance of participation in administration without its legal forms.

"The main contention of this address is that the actual usages and tendencies of the best institutions in this regard should be more explicitly legalized in the constitutions and by-laws of universities. As a matter of history it seems to be undoubtedly the case that when, in the not very remote past, there were in America no large universities serving multifarious interests, when the elder among our present great universities were like the small colleges of to-day in curricula, aims and numbers, the faculties exercised much larger administrative functions. The older American college was more or less like a large family. The professors and the students knew each other; the professors and the trustees knew each other, and the alumni were known to all the older members of the faculty. The growth in numbers and in the complexity of educational concerns and aims, have perforce, brought to pass a greater administrative specialization as well as a greater curricular specialization. The growth of higher education is parallel here to the industrial development. Without doubt, this specialization of function has been developed in the interests of economy of effort and productive efficiency. The great problem in education, as in industry, is to harmonize administrative efficiency in large concerns with that humane value of self-determination and self-respect, in the life of the worker, without which his work will surely deteriorate in quality. We hear, on all hands, of the demands of the industrial worker for a voice in the control of the industry. I do not think that the parallelism between industry and higher education can be carried out on all fours; but, inasmuch as the work of higher education is wrought by mind on mind, and material instruments are here wholly subordinate to life interests, insofar as the parallelism in ques-

tion breaks down, it does so in favor of the resumption of a greater measure of control by the faculty in administration. The professor deals with the mind as a living unity and, therefore, should always consider his own work as an element in the whole educational process; whereas the industrial worker may make a rivet or bore a hole without taking account of the making of the whole machine. I wish to insist most strongly that no good educator can be a mere pigeon-hole specialist or pure departmentalist.

"In good institutions, faculties do then informally participate to a large extent in university administration, but, without the constitutional forms to protect it, the substance of healthy faculty participation in administration may vanish at any time when a governing board succumbs to extraneous influences inimical to the nurture of the highest quality of instruction and research. These influences may come from the unenlightened interests of portions of the general public, of the alumni, or from the lack of high educational standards and moral courage in the president as well as in the governing board, or from several or all of these sources. To be specific on one point, it is certainly not conducive to an improvement in the morale and personnel of the faculty when a small body of laymen, themselves incompetent to evaluate teaching and productive ability, and acting solely on the advice of a president who may be neither a great scholar or educator, nor a sound judge of scholarship, can determine, without regard to the judgments of those who have expert knowledge, not only the economic and academic fates of genuine productive scholars and teachers but, as well, the fundamental policies of the institution in which these scholars and teachers must do their work. . . .

"The question of the powers of faculties with regard to tenure and procedure in dismissals is a knotty one. I do not believe that, in the present transitional phase of our higher education, we can afford to accept, without qualification, the dogma of life tenure for professors. Mistakes in election are sometimes made. They should be rectified, even though their rectification works hardship to individuals, since failure to rectify them works immeasurable injury to numbers of plastic and gifted minds—the select youth who constitute the greatest riches and the most radiant promise of the body social. We professors must, as a corporate body and as individuals, always be ready to have the

status of our vocation and its social evaluation determined by the contribution which we are making to the upbuilding of the living minds of the new generation. If a faculty be competent, if it deserve the name of university faculty, it should participate in administration; insofar as it may be incompetent, its house should be set in order, by concerted action. For this reason I believe that the final power of appointment and dismissal should continue to rest with the governing board, subject to the provisos stated below. On the other hand, the right of the faculty to participate, in judgment and determination upon cases of dismissal, is essential to the safeguarding of proper academic freedom. No body of laymen can be safely intrusted with the sole power to determine, even with the advice of the president, the nature and limits of freedom of teaching. In the majority of cases where dismissals have been made by trustees alone during the past few years the causes have been chiefly either economic, ethical, political or other forms of heresy or insubordination. The mentally inert and stupid, the lazy or otherwise incompetent on the faculty, have rarely been disturbed by the governing boards. I regret to say that boards, and sometimes faculties too, often suffer amiable morons more gladly than marked nonconformist individualities. The university that has no heretics on its faculty is a dead one.

"Universities should not be run as mere business concerns. The election of a professor is a step that should not be taken unadvisedly or lightly, but soberly and discreetly. When the institution has made a mistake it should accept the responsibility and share the burden of the mistake. The status of a professor should be, normally, one of high dignity, security and permanence. It can not be made a very gainful occupation. Only through dignity and security in the calling can we insure good men and good work. Therefore, no professor should be summarily dismissed, nor without the opportunity of a full investigation by a jury of his peers. If it be the final decision that he is unfit to continue in office, then he should have at least a year's notice and leave of absence with salary to enable him to find a more suitable place. Possibly the time is not far distant when, by the general elevation of the standard for the profession, it will be safe to accord generally a life tenure. But, taking the country as a whole, that time is not yet. . . .

"If there is to be any distinction in dignity and power, the faculty should be the upper house; the governing board might be regarded as a standing committee of the Commons as well as the property-holding corporation for the Commons (which is the public). The president is the coordinator and harmonizer of the views of the other bodies. It may be said that the faculty is engaged to teach, and, if its members have any time and energy left, to investigate and write; but its primary business is to do the job it is hired to do and in the way in which the governing board, out of its wisdom in interpreting the public demands, sees fit to dictate, just as a bricklayer is hired to lay bricks without criticizing the purpose or architecture of the edifice. This view of the faculty's function has found frequent expression in reputable journals and is held by some citizens and possibly by a few trustees; but I have no time to waste in debating with anybody who puts the work of the faculty in the same category as that of janitors and clerks. Persons who hold such views have not the faintest inkling of the meaning and purpose of a university. A faculty may be wrong—'To err is human'—but if a faculty is not more competent to decide upon the wisdom or integrity of the deeds of its executives, if it is not better fitted to determine whether the actual administrative conditions are a help or a hindrance to the performance of its own public services than any body of laymen, then the institution is not a real university. The incompetence of the faculty reflects the failure of the governing board and the administration, and if the institution is not a real university it needs to be either wiped out of existence or cleaned thoroughly from cellar to garret. It needs scarcely to be said that the general discussion of this paper does not apply to such institutions. Concluding this brief résumé of the various administrative functions of the faculty, I would again enter a plea for open-minded discussion and experimentation.

"Fuller constitutional recognition of the rights and duties of the faculty in administration are herein advocated chiefly on two grounds which are interdependent; namely, improvement in the faculty personnel and morale, and improvement in the quality of their services to society. Notwithstanding the great and rapid growth in universities, in numbers of students, teachers and graduates, and in productive output, it is obvious to any well-informed

observer, that we have not been getting the results we might get. No doubt the universities will exert an ever increasing, and, on the whole, a bettering influence on American life. In spite of the omnipotence of governing boards, the reputed omniscience of presidents, the ineptitude of faculty meetings and the extraordinary immunity of undergraduates to intellectual infection, we must have *faith* in education, for, 'Faith is the evidence of things not seen, the substance of things hoped for.' But we are only scratching the surface of the educational possibilities, and we are not even scratching the surface very thoroughly. Various forms of extra-curricular, student activities arouse on the part of many of the student body a keener interest than the work of classroom, library and laboratory. The fact that the side shows are of more interest to many students than the main circus is partial evidence, at least, of the failure of the ring-masters and performers in the main circus. If a large proportion of lively youth are not intrigued by the business of higher education, there is something wrong with the conduct of this business. Too large a proportion of our university teachers appear to students to be ineffective molly-coddles. We sorely need to make the professorate a man-sized job, not a sailor's snugharbor for persons of neuter gender. There is a faint color of truth in the saying, 'There are three sexes, men, women and teachers.' We must have a more dynamic type of university teacher and investigator, teachers with more vigorous and inspiring personalities, with more mental initiative, teachers who are not satisfied to go through the motions of classroom work and imitation research. In short, our profession has not succeeded in recruiting a sufficient proportion of the first rate native minds that are born in every generation. How shall we do better? For one thing, I am sure we must establish more striking differentials in salary scales. We must make it possible for really able men to win decent incomes in the profession, incomes that will compete in attractiveness, when there is added to them the other delights of the profession, with those enjoyed by leading members of other professions, such as medicine, law, engineering and even business. It is not part of my province to discuss the salary question, but I wish to say that while higher salaries are necessary, they will not be enough. Self-determination is a hackneyed word to-day, but it is a good word. The professors are either the best educa-

tional experts of the country, or else they are hollow shams. If we are to have men of vigor and initiative practising the profession of handing on to the new generation the accrued achievements of the higher civilization, and of adding to these achievements, we must order the operation of our universities, so that, in all matters that vitally touch the practise of university teaching and research, those who are the experts will have the freest field possible to function effectively as experts. It is disheartening enough and it lames efficiency not to be able to make a decent livelihood in the practise of a profession than which there is none more essential to the ongoing and improvement of civilization; but it is still more disheartening and still more lames efficiency when the competent professor sees, and is powerless to prevent, the dilution and cheapening of the educational work of the institution through its succumbing to the ever imminent and insistent pressure to spread out its work over more and more ill-prepared and unpurposeful students, and to see the institution rush hastily, without adequate equipment and personnel, into new educational enterprises. One of the curses of higher education in this country to-day is the apparent worship by the public, alumni, governing boards and administrators, yes, and tell it not in Gath, publish it not in Gilead, the worship, even by professors, of the golden calf of quantity production. The most serious menace to the maintenance or improvement of the qualitative standards of higher education to-day comes from the ever-rising flood of freshmen. Faculties seem to be powerless in the face of this menace. The situation is especially alarming in the state universities. Legislatures, being without knowledge, do not appreciate the situation; the governing boards face it only intermittently, namely in trying to find the money for new instructors; the faculties are face-to-face with it every day; privately they groan over it, publicly they are passive and silent; theirs not to reason why, theirs but to teach and die. The numbers roll up, the courses multiply by fission, like the lower organisms; universities rush to get cheap and inexperienced teachers who sometimes are not even worth the pittances they are paid, to turn out ever growing hordes of graduates who have amassed the correct number of credit slips, but who have no clear idea of scholarly or scientific method, no real insight into the meaning of education, no exacting standards of thought and taste. The in-

rush of hordes of unselected and badly prepared students has its touching aspect. It is in part at least an expression of the yearning of our democracy for spiritual development and of a blind faith in the mystic power of education to transmute the soul of youth by some alchemy or magic into nobler and worthier life. But we do disservice to democracy when we fail to exercise rigorously the process of selection by which only those qualified by nature and nurture are chosen to be the responsive subjects of university education. We must get rid of that democratic form of sentimentality which ignores the inexorable fact that in every generation, by the operation of the blind forces of nature or by the will of God (call it what you will, it matters not), only a small minority of the youth have the native capacity for acquiring the highest degree of education. To dissipate our energies and our resources in the universities in catering to every comer is to do injustice to the more gifted, and in the long run to our democracy. For we fail to train up leaders, and we foster the illusion on the part of the many that they are getting a higher education.

"I recognize that a considerable proportion of our faculty members are not fit to do things any better than they are now doing. I recognize that some of them are not now fit to pass balanced and wise judgments on matters of educational policy. It is a day of confusion and unrest in education, as in the body politic. The children are come to the birth and there is not strength to bear them. But I do not see how we can expect to make our universities more effectual ministrants of a higher civilization, unless we can make them better nurturing grounds for that aristocracy of intelligence, character and taste, of which democracy stands in such sore need, for its leaders and exemplars everywhere in public life—in politics, in art, letters, the drama, social philosophy and practise. We are living in an era which has made jettison of inherited standards of thought, conduct and social order; and has as yet brought forth no new, more organic and coherent standards to take their place. We have not, and we do not want, a hereditary aristocracy based on vested privileges and legal and economic injustice. We have not, but we sorely need and must develop, if our civilization is to endure and progress, a spiritual élite, an aristocracy imbued with the sense of service, of noblesse oblige; one which is ever being built

up to the highest point of power by the selection of those with the best native capacities, and by the intensive training of these superior native capacities to the highest point possible. It is the function of the university to be in the fullest sense the transmitter of culture, the initiator of the selected in every generation into a comprehensive and balanced consciousness of the creative meaning of civilization, into a recognition of the cardinal fact that civilization is made and renewed and enhanced just in the degree in which the heritage of culture quickens, nurtures, and expands the individual mind; where else can this work be done if not in the university? Where are we to look for sound judgment and wise insight, for unprejudiced facing of facts, for the fresh determination of facts and their interpretation in terms of human values if not to the university men? We certainly can not look for it in the market place, in the popular journals, or on the political rostrum. Can the blind lead the blind? Can the natural élite become, by intensive cultivation, the educated élite, if they are taught by persons who are themselves incapable of seeing and kindling to the great vocation of the university teacher, as the custodian of the rational and spiritual interests of civilization? How can we expect a more virile and creative type of teacher and scholar if he is to have no effective part in determining the conditions under which he works? I would put the plea for greater faculty participation in university affairs then, not on the ground that it will make us more at ease in Zion; but on the ground that it will increase our burdens and responsibilities; and may thereby enable us to grow up to our tasks, may nerve us to be more effective participants in the perpetuation and improvement of civilization. If I am right in contending that the conservation and progress of the higher civilization in America depends chiefly on the universities, it follows that any proposed change in the method of conducting university affairs should be tried by this test: Will it, or will it not, make the universities more effective instruments for the conservation of whatsoever is worth conserving in the culture of the past, and for the increase of that culture by new insights in science, letters, art, social thought and practise; will it be more effective in the selection and functioning of a better personnel? The university exists to serve the mass, not directly, but indirectly by conserving and improving the best instruments of

culture, not by taking its culture from the mass. It can not do this unless its daily work is carried on by a vigorous, competent, self-respecting personnel. Its task is more exacting, perhaps, than that of any other institution in our civilization. Time was when the church was the chief custodian of a higher civilization. That time has long since gone by. Time was when in an hereditary aristocracy resided the custodianship of culture. That time too has gone by. Democracy is in the saddle and does not know whither it is riding. Unless it supports and nurtures an institution which can find a way and lead it, democracy is riding to a bad fall. This institution for democracy is the university. My argument for more recognized participation by the faculty in administration has, as its central thesis, the belief that this change would be a means by which the members of the faculty might grow up to a keener sense of their great tasks, and develop more strength to discharge them. Our supreme functions are, as I have indicated, to be the conservators and the improvers of human culture: That is to say, of culture as a means for the improvement of the human race. It is only as conscious of the difficulty and the worthiness of our tasks as servants of the common-weal, that we should ask for anything. We should ask for a more effective participation in the direction of university policies only that thereby we may be freer to serve more effectively the whole of society by better conserving, transmitting and improving the cultural implements for the perfection of man."—*Joseph A. Leighton, Ohio State University.*

THE AMERICAN OXONIAN.—Volume 8, No. 1, January, 1921, gives an interesting statistical survey of the record of the American Rhodes Scholarships from 1904 to 1916. The general result may be inferred from the editorial following:

"We have examined in considerable detail the facts of the record of the American Rhodes Scholars so far as these facts are capable of summary in statistics of the type used. It is now appropriate to survey the record from a broader point of view and see what light, if any, they shed on general questions in regard to the Rhodes Scholarships. Has the scheme, for instance, realized the expectations of the Founder? If not, have the scholarships justified themselves in other ways? Rhodes planned

to bring the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race into closer sympathy with each other; any gain to the individual who was used as an instrument to this end, was merely incidental to this plan. For the success of Rhodes' plan as he conceived it, it is essential that the men selected be high-grade men who give promise of becoming leaders in American life, that they react favorably to the Oxford environment and learn to appreciate its values, and that on their return they enter occupations which afford them an opportunity to influence their countrymen. It is certainly pertinent evidence on the first of these points that about three-fourths of the men are of high scholastic standing in their own institutions as measured by the standard for election to Phi Beta Kappa. Their willingness to conform to Oxford custom is indicated by their general participation in Oxford activities—by the facts that seventy per cent have participated actively in the athletics of their Oxford colleges, and that about the same proportion have taken the same degree—B.A.—as taken by most Englishmen, although most of the Americans have already secured that degree before arrival in Oxford. The high standard of ability of the group is further indicated by their very considerable success in the honors examinations, although they have not been able to equal the pick of the British students in the studies for which the latter are specially prepared.

"In regard to the probable future influence of the Rhodes Scholars in American life, the critic may point out the absence of politics and diplomacy from the list of occupations, and the small number in public service of any type. Several men as a side issue have been candidates for office:—Congress, Secretary of State for a state, and so forth, and one man is 'chairman of the State Committee' of his party. Only one man, so far as known, is in the permanent diplomatic service, although a number of men engaged in that type of activity during the war. The expectation of Rhodes, or at least of some of the early writers on the subject, was that the Rhodes Scholars would enter politics in the English sense, or go into the diplomatic service. But neither of these lines affords a career in the United States for a man with his own way to make; the organization of the diplomatic service rather than the scholars or the scholarship plan, is to blame for this imperfect fulfillment of early expectations.

"But even while it is admitted that in politics and diplomacy

the original intent of the plan has not been realized, and is not likely to be realized, one should realize fully the significance of the large proportion—over one-third—of the men engaged in education, especially college teaching. There is a closer relationship in the United States than in any other country between education and public life; we are therefore justified in saying that the Rhodes Scholars in that occupation are in a position to exert as great an influence as they could in any other line—even in politics—and more than in the American diplomatic service. In view of the close relation between law and political life in this country some of the scholars engaged in the practice of law may be expected to become leaders in political life after their professional position is established. In their case, as for all the scholars, it should be remembered that the oldest Rhodes Scholars are still young and that in American political and social life, most of the leaders are selected from those who have demonstrated their worth in their own profession or business. From this point of view, the important thing is that the Rhodes Scholars should be 'making good' each in his own line. We may, therefore, hope that the inclusion of seventeen men in 'Who's Who' and the satisfactory academic standing of the college teachers among the Rhodes Scholars, are straws that show that the wind is blowing towards a satisfactory future, in which it will be a fact obvious to all that the Rhodes Scholarships have accomplished something towards fostering Anglo-Saxon solidarity and assuring the peace of the world."

A National Survey of State Universities.—How should it be undertaken?

"Even in the wealthiest states and those possessed of the most enlightened fiscal systems there is growing anxiety as to how the means can be secured to meet the increasing burden of education and especially higher education. The public higher institutions of the country never before faced a threat so dangerous. We have come to the day when the question must be answered—can states afford free higher education? Facts are already at hand to prove that they cannot afford it unless all property within the border of the state can be brought to pay its just tithe for public purposes. The future of state higher institutions is intimately bound

up with the development of state taxation. Their very lives are at stake. The propaganda of the past two years on behalf of more liberal support of education has been based on the assumption that money could be had from the ordinary sources if public sentiment were aroused. The assumption is evidently incorrect. The propagandists, particularly those active in the cause of higher education, have not addressed themselves to the right issue.

"Since the staffs of higher institutions generally contain the leading local experts on economics and government it seems obvious that the obligation rests upon the state institutions to enlighten the public as to this emergency and to suggest practical remedies. I believe a careful study should be made in every state of the state's wealth, its system of taxation, its method of distributing monies for educational and other purposes. I realize that the making of such studies may be classed among the extra hazardous occupations. Large property interests will not scruple to interfere and their tactics will not always be gentle. Nevertheless, the universities are better equipped for this service than any other agencies. If they do not undertake it, no one else is likely to."—*The Educational Record, January, 1921.*

The *Educational Review* for December, 1920, contains articles by J. A. Leighton (Ohio State) on University Government and by H. W. Tyler (Mass. Institute of Technology) on Academic Freedom.

COMMITTEES FOR 1921

Executive Committee of the Council

E. R. A. SELIGMAN (Columbia), *Chairman*

HENRY CREW (Northwestern) A. O. LOVEJOY (Johns Hopkins)
HARRIS HANCOCK (Cincinnati) H. W. TYLER (Mass. Inst. Tech.)
H. C. LANCASTER (Johns Hopkins) MARIAN P. WHITNEY (Vassar)

Committee to Nominate Officers

J. H. LATANÉ (Johns Hopkins), *Chairman*

J. M. COULTER (Chicago) J. A. LEIGHTON (Ohio)
W. H. FAULKNER (Virginia) L. J. RICHARDSON (California)

STANDING COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE A

Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure

Chairman, F. S. Deibler (Econ.), Northwestern

C. M. Andrews (History), Yale; H. M. Bates (Law), Michigan; R. T. Ely (Econ.), Wisconsin; F. A. Fetter (Econ.), Princeton; F. H. Hodder (History), Kansas; George Lefevre (Zool.), Missouri; J. P. Lichtenberger (Sociol.), Pennsylvania; F. R. Lillie (Zool.), Chicago; A. O. Lovejoy (Philos.), Hopkins; D. O. McGovney (Law), Iowa; F. M. Padelford (Eng.), Washington (State); G. L. Roberts (Educ.), Purdue; U. G. Weatherly (Sociol.), Indiana; A. L. Wheeler (Latin), Bryn Mawr.

COMMITTEE F

Admission of Members

Chairman, Florence Bascom (Geol.), Bryn Mawr

A. L. Keith (Latin), Carleton; J. Q. Dealey (Sociol.), Brown; F. A. Saunders (Physics), Harvard; G. H. Marx (Engin.), Stanford; F. C. Woodward (Law), Chicago.

COMMITTEE I

University Ethics

Chairman, G. P. Costigan, Jr. (Law), Northwestern

John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; W. B. Munro (Pol. Sci.), Harvard; E. A. Ross (Sociol.), Wisconsin; J. H. Tufts (Philos.), Chicago; H. C. Warren (Psychol.), Princeton; U. G. Weatherly (Sociol.), Indiana.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE B

Methods of Appointment and Promotion

Chairman, T. H. Morgan (Zool.), Columbia

F. F. Abbott (Latin), Princeton; G. E. Barnett (Econ.), Hopkins; J. S. Bassett (History), Smith; C. E. Bennett (Latin), Cornell; Percy Bordwell (Law), Iowa; J. M. Coulter (Botany), Chicago; Clive Day (Econ.), Yale; Max Farrand (History), Yale; J. F. Genung (Eng.), Amherst; R. L. Green (Math.), Stanford; E. E. Hale (Eng.), Union; W. E. McElfresh (Physics), Williams; W. A. Noyes (Chem.), Illinois; J. E. Raycroft (Phys. Cult.), Princeton; R. M. Wenley (Philos.), Michigan; J. A. Woodburn (History), Indiana.

COMMITTEE C

Methods of Recruiting the Teaching Profession (by Scholarships and Fellowships, etc.)

Chairman, G. E. Barnett (Econ.), Johns Hopkins

E. W. Brown (Math.), Yale; J. E. Creighton (Philos.), Cornell; Warner Fite (Philos.), Princeton; C. H. Haskins (History), Harvard; A. O. Leuschner (Astron.), California; A. H. Lloyd (Philos.), Michigan; A. W. Small (Sociol.), Chicago; J. S. P. Tatlock (Eng.), Stanford; H. B. Ward (Zool.), Illinois.

COMMITTEE D

General and Vocational Education (awaiting organization)

Committee E

Extent of the Employment of Student Assistants and the Effect on Quality of Undergraduate Instruction and on Graduate Work of the Student Assistants

Chairman, L. L. Woodruff (Biol.), Yale

H. Babson (Mod. Lang.), Purdue; Mary W. Calkins (Philos.), Wellesley; E. H. Cameron (Educ.), Illinois; B. M. Duggar (Botany), Washington (St. Louis); I. Hardesty (Anat.), Tulane; L. M. Hoskins (Engin.), Stanford; D. A. McCabe (Sociol.), Princeton; W. McPherson (Chem.), Ohio State; L. F. Mott (Eng.), City of New York; W. B. Munro (Pol. Sci.), Harvard; S. E. Stout (Latin), Indiana; C. H. Van Tyne (History), Michigan.

Committee G

Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates

Chairman, Frank Aydelotte (Eng.), Mass. Inst. Tech.

H. E. Bourne (History), Western Reserve; J. J. Coss (Psychol.), Columbia; C. M. Gayley (Eng.), California; J. W. Hudson (Philos.), Missouri; L. Levine (Econ.), Beloit; G. A. Miller (Math.), Illinois; R. B. Perry (Philos.), Harvard; G. Showerman (Latin), Wisconsin; J. S. P. Tatlock (Eng.), Stanford; A. E. Watson (Engin.), Brown; Lilian Welsh (Physiol.), Goucher; E. H. Wilkins (Rom. Lang.), Chicago; H. V. Wilson (Biol.), North Carolina.

Committee H

Desirability and Practicability of Increased Migration and Interchange of Graduate Students

Chairman, A. O. Leuschner (Astron.), California

F. W. Blackmar (History), Kansas; A. T. Clay (Philol.), Yale; J. H. Gray (Econ.), Carleton; E. R. Hedrick (Math.), Missouri; F. W. Kelsey (Latin), Michigan; A. W. Meyer (Anat.), Stanford; A. W. Small (Sociol.), Chicago; F. W. Taussig (Econ.), Harvard; J. W. Young (Math.), Dartmouth.

COMMITTEE K

Systems for Sabbatical Years

Chairman, Joseph Jastrow (Psychol.), Wisconsin

C. M. Andrews (History), Yale; O. J. Campbell (Eng.), Wisconsin; Margaret C. Ferguson (Botany), Wellesley; Tenney Frank (Latin), Johns Hopkins; J. W. Garner (Pol. Sci.), Illinois; A. C. Lanier (Engin.), Missouri; Ernest Merritt (Physics), Cornell; J. B. Pratt (Philos.), Williams; F. N. Scott (Eng.), Michigan; R. M. Wenley (Philos.), Michigan; Frederick Slocum (Astron.), Wesleyan.

COMMITTEE L

Cooperation with Latin-American Universities to Promote Exchange Professorships and Fellowships, etc.

Chairman, L. S. Rowe (Director Pan-American Union), Washington

S. I. Bailey (Astron.), Harvard; Hiram Bingham (History), Yale; Geo. H. Blakeslee (History), Clark; E. E. Brandon (Rom. Lang.), Miami; Philip M. Brown (Int. Law), Princeton; A. C. Coolidge (History), Harvard; A. C. Flick (History), Syracuse; J. D. M. Ford (Span.), Harvard; E. C. Hills (Rom. Lang.), Indiana; J. H. Hollander (Econ.), Hopkins; W. E. Hotchkiss (Econ.), Chicago, Ill.; Wm. J. Hussey (Astron.), Michigan; C. C. Marden (Span.), Princeton; C. C. Plehn (Econ.), California; E. A. Ross (Sociol.), Wisconsin; Arthur R. Seymour (Rom. Lang.), Illinois; C. A. Smith (Eng.), U. S. Naval Academy; Glen L. Swiggett (Rom. Lang.), Washington, D. C.; Walter S. Tower (Geog.), Maplewood, N.J.; Raymond Weeks (Rom. Lang.), Columbia.

COMMITTEE P

Systems of Pensions and Insurance for University Teachers

Chairman, W. W. Cook (Law), Columbia

T. S. Adams (Econ.), Yale; F. S. Deibler (Econ.), Northwestern; F. H. Dixon (Econ.), Princeton; T. C. Esty (Math.),

Amherst; H. B. Gardner (Econ.), Brown; W. F. Gephart (Econ.), Washington (St. Louis); J. H. Gray (Econ.), Carleton; M. W. Haskell (Math.), California; Otto Heller (Philos.), Washington (St. Louis); J. H. Hollander (Econ.), Hopkins; S. S. Huebner (Econ.), Pennsylvania; Joseph Jastrow (Psychol.), Wisconsin; E. W. Kemmerer (Econ.), Princeton; A. C. Lane (Geol.), Tufts; A. O. Lovejoy (Philos.), Hopkins; H. A. Millis (Econ.), Chicago; C. C. Plehn (Finance), California; H. L. Rietz (Math.), Iowa; H. F. Stone (Law), Columbia; A. H. Thorndike (Eng.), Columbia; H. S. White (Math.), Vassar; W. F. Willcox (Econ.), Cornell.

Committee R

Encouragement of University Research

Chairman, A. C. L. Brown (Celtic), Northwestern

E. C. Armstrong (French), Princeton; C. Becker (History), Cornell; A. R. Hohlfeld (German), Wisconsin; R. G. Kent (Comp. Philol.), Pennsylvania; E. P. Lewis (Physics), California; J. L. Lowes (Eng.), Harvard; W. A. Nitze (Rom. Lang.), Chicago; W. A. Oldfather (Latin), Illinois; C. C. Torrey (Oriental Lang.), Yale.

Committee T

Place and Function of Faculties in University Government and Administration

Chairman, J. A. Leighton (Philos.), Ohio

B. H. Bode (Philos.), Illinois; F. H. Dixon (Econ.), Princeton; E. A. Gilmore (Law), Wisconsin; R. G. Harrison (Anat.), Yale; F. H. Hodder (History), Kansas; Theodore Hough (Medicine), Virginia; J. B. Johnston (Medicine), Minnesota; L. E. Lord (Latin), Oberlin; Paul Monroe (Educ.), Columbia; L. T. More (Physics), Cincinnati; Lucy M. Salmon (History), Vassar; M. W. Sampson (Eng.), Cornell; A. B. Wolfe (Econ.), Texas.

Committee V

Apparatus for Productive Scholarship

Chairman, F. J. Teggart (History), California

C. D. Buck (Sanskrit), Chicago; G. H. Chase (Archaeol.),

Harvard; Clive Day (Econ.), Yale; J. A. Fairlie (Pol. Sci.), Illinois; Max Farrand (History), Yale; G. T. Flom (Scand. Lang.), Illinois; C. H. Grandgent (Italian), Harvard; M. F. Guyer (Zool.), Wisconsin; G. L. Hamilton (French and Rom. Philol.), Cornell; A. R. Hatton (Government), Western Reserve; P. J. Healey (Eccles. History), Catholic University of Washington; E. R. Hedrick (Math. and Astron.), Missouri; M. Jastrow, Jr. (Sem. Lang.), Pennsylvania; V. L. Kellogg (National Research Council), Washington, D.C.; C. Knapp (Latin), Columbia; B. E. Livingston (Botany), Hopkins; J. C. Merriam (Paleon.), (Carnegie Inst. of Wash.), Washington, D.C.; D. R. Stuart (Greek), Princeton; F. Thilly (Philos.), Cornell; J. W. Tupper (Eng.), Lafayette; C. P. Wagner (Hisp. Lang.), Michigan.

Committee W

Status of Women in College and University Faculties

Chairman, A. C. Ellis (Educ.), Texas

Florence Bascom (Geol.), Bryn Mawr; Cora J. Beckwith (Zool.), Vassar; Harriet W. Bigelow (Astron.), Smith; Isabelle Bronk (French), Swarthmore; Carleton Brown (Philol.), Minnesota; Caroline Colvin (Latin), Maine; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; Anna J. McKeag (Educ.), Wellesley; D. C. Munro (History), Princeton; Helen M. Searles (Latin), Mt. Holyoke; W. F. Willcox (Econ.), Cornell.

Committee Y

Formulation of Guiding Principles for the Conduct of Higher Education

Chairman, Frank Thilly (Philos.), Cornell

Frank Aydelotte (Eng.), Mass. Inst. Tech.; Irving Babbitt (Comp. Lit.), Harvard; H. M. Bates (Law), Michigan; Franz Boaz (Anthrop.), Columbia; Mary W. Calkins (Psychol.), Wellesley; J. M. Coulter (Botany), Chicago; D. R. Dewey (Econ.), Mass. Inst. Tech.; Lucile Eaves (Sociol.), Simmons; Irving Fisher (Pol. Sci.), Yale; F. H. Giddings (Sociol.), Columbia; E. E. Hale (Eng.), Union; C. H. Haskins (History), Harvard; G. E. Howard

(Pol. Sci.), Nebraska; J. Jastrow (Semitic Lang.), Wisconsin; Vernon L. Kellogg (National Research Council), Washington; Shailer Mathews (Theol.), Chicago; William McPherson (Chem.), Ohio; R. A. Millikan (Physics), Chicago; L. T. More (Physics), Cincinnati; W. B. Munro (Government), Harvard; H. W. Tyler (Math.), Mass. Inst. Tech.; John H. Wigmore (Law), Northwestern.

Committee Z

The Economic Condition of the Profession

Chairman, T. N. Carver (Econ.), Harvard

C. C. Arbuthnot (Econ.), Western Reserve; Amy L. Reed (Library), Vassar; W. T. Semple (Latin), Cincinnati; Alexander Silverman (Chem.), Pittsburgh.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred and one nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions,* and will be considered by the Committee if received before May 20th, 1921.

The Committee on Admissions* consists of Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Chairman, J. Q. Dealey (Brown), A. L. Keith (Carleton), G. H. Marx (Stanford), F. A. Saunders (Harvard), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

John A. Aldrich (Physics), Washburn
Alonzo H. Arbaugh (Bible and Religion), Carthage
Grace M. Bareis (Mathematics), Ohio
W. E. Barlow (Metallurgy), Virginia Polytechnic
H. M. Beatty (Mathematics), Ohio
Edith M. Beaumont (Education), South Dakota
James M. Bell (Chemistry), North Carolina
John Manning Booker (English), North Carolina
James E. Boyd (Mechanics), Ohio
E. C. Branson (Romance Languages), North Carolina
Friedrich Bruns (German), Wisconsin
Theo. P. Campbell (Modern Languages), Virginia Polytechnic
Harry Sharp Cannon (German), Minnesota
Vaughn B. Caris (Mathematics), Ohio
Fred Donald Carpenter (German), Vermont
Clarence Edwin Carter (History), Miami
F. R. Castleman (Physical Education), Ohio
Merle E. Chapin (English), Carthage
W. B. Coggin (Education), Virginia Polytechnic
Arthur C. Cole (History), Ohio
Benjamin M. Davis (Biology), Miami
U. W. Denman (Industrial Arts), Ohio
Louise D. Dennis (Spanish), Vassar

* Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Henry B. Dewing (Classics), Princeton
Hal Downey (Animal Biology), Minnesota
E. P. Durrant (Physiology), Ohio
Clair A. Dye (Pharmacy), Ohio
B. A. Eisenlohr (German), Ohio
Ellsworth D. Elston (Geology and Mineralogy), Dartmouth
Eleanor Ferris (History), Western Reserve
H. F. Fore (English), Purdue
Harry C. Fortner (Zoology), Tennessee
John Sayward Galbraith (Greek and Latin), Williams
Edward H. Garden (Economics), Wisconsin
C. E. Gehlke (Sociology), Western Reserve
Vernette L. Gibbons (Chemistry), Mills
Hans E. Gronow (German), Chicago
James Holly Hanford (English), North Carolina
Sada Annis Harbarger (English), Ohio
T. L. Harris (Sociology), Miami
Edward F. Hauch (Romance Languages), Rutgers
James J. Hayes (English), Morningside
William K. Hill (Chemistry), Carthage
Amy Howe (Home Economics), Purdue
Jesse E. Hyde (Geology), Western Reserve
Dennis E. Jackson (Pharmacology), Cincinnati
Nelson A. Kellogg (Physical Education), Purdue
Willard A. Knapp (Civil Engineering), Purdue
William Koren (Modern Languages), Princeton
D. S. Lancaster (Agricultural Education), Virginia Polytechnic
William Stowell Leavenworth (Chemistry), Illinois College
Sturgis E. Leavitt (Romance Languages), North Carolina
Julian Ira Lindsay (English), Vermont
Frederic P. Lord (Anatomy), Dartmouth
Erwin F. Lowry (Physics), Ohio
F. E. Lumley (Economics and Sociology), Ohio
Marguerite Mallon (Home Economics), Purdue
Vera McCoy Masters (Bacteriology), Ohio
William J. McCaughey (Mineralogy), Ohio
Charles C. McCracken (Administration), Ohio
Grace Medes (Physiology), Vassar
T. E. Mergendahl (Mathematics), Tufts
Francis I. Moats (History and Economics), Illinois College

Warren E. Montsie (French), Dartmouth
C. A. Moore (English), Minnesota
Bayard Q. Morgan (German), Wisconsin
Leslie F. Murch (Physics), Dartmouth
John H. Nichols (Physical Education), Ohio
C. M. Newman (English), Virginia Polytechnic
Anna H. Palmié (Mathematics), Western Reserve
Andrew Henry Patterson (Physics), North Carolina
Milton Percival (English), Ohio
Ruth Shepard Phelps (Romance Languages), Minnesota
Herbert S. Philbrick (Mechanical Engineering), Northwestern
H. L. Price (Horticulture), Virginia Polytechnic
William F. Prouty (Geology), North Carolina
George Rebec (Education), Reed
Hilda Marie Raetzmann (Modern Languages), Illinois College
James P. Richardson (Political Science), Dartmouth
C. K. Robbins (Mathematics), Purdue
Gertrude Lucile Robinson (English), Ohio
Alexander Russell (Music), Princeton
Letta Simmons (Education), Carthage
Irwin W. Smith (Mathematics), North Dakota Agricultural
Alice D. Snyder (English), Vassar
W. Carl Spielman (History), Carthage
Howard M. Stuckert (History), Ohio
May Thomas (German), Ohio
Lynn Thorndike (History), Western Reserve
Oliver Towles (French), North Carolina
George Ransom Twiss (Education), Ohio
Eldon L. Usry (Education), Ohio
C. A. Van Velzer (Mathematics), Carthage
J. H. Voss (Modern Languages), Carthage
James H. Weaver (Mathematics), Ohio
Herbert W. Whitten (Classics), Carthage
John E. Williams (Mathematics), Virginia Polytechnic
Joseph T. Williams (Psychology and Education), Drury
Stanley Thomas Williams (English), Yale
George A. Wood (History), Ohio
W. A. Zehring (Mathematics), Purdue